REMARKS

The Office Action of 10/04/2005 has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the specification and claims have been amended as set forth above. Reconsideration in view of the foregoing amendments and the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5, 7 and 15-17 were rejected as being unpatentable over the base combination of Fisher in view of Barry. Claims 6 and 14 were rejected as being unpatentable over the base combination further in view of Lilja. Claims 8 and 9 were rejected as being unpatentable over the base combination further in view of Maiyuran. Claims 10 and 12 were rejected as being unpatentable over the base combination further in view of Sanches. Claims 11 was rejected as being unpatentable over the base combination further in view of Sanches and further still in view of Maiyuran. Claims 13 was rejected as being unpatentable over the base combination further in view of Takayama. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

With respect to the rejection of claims 1-5 and 7, the Office Actions states in part:

> Fisher does not disclose a detection unit to control the way execution unit parallelizes processing of the instruction depending on the detected range of instruction address. However, Barry discloses the above limitations (Column 1, lines 44-55)....

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Although Barry describes detecting whether an instruction address has changed, Barry in fact nowhere describes detecting a range of an instruction address. Moreover, although Barry describes causing a change in program flow by loading the program counter with a new instruction address in response to a "change of state eventpoint,"

7

Barry nowhere describes controlling the way execution units parallelize processing of an instruction based on an address range of the instruction.

Withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-17 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: 01/04/2007

8